UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,374	02/15/2002	Mihaela Van Der Schaar	US 020044	1300

24737 7590 05/05/2005

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
CZEKAJ, DAVID J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2613	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/076,374	VAN DER SCHAAR, MIHAELA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dave Czekaj	2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 January 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6,9-12 and 17-19* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *5,7,8,13-16 and 20* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *04 April 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

On page 6, the applicant argues that Chen does not disclose decomposing the transform block in each of a plurality of bit planes or discrete quantization steps before decomposing coefficients for a next one of the transform blocks in the image frame, but rather decomposes coefficients for all the blocks of the entire bit plane. While the applicant's points are understood, the examiner respectfully disagrees. See for example Chen figure 17. There Chen illustrates decomposing coefficients one transform block at a time. The examiner notes that since Chen decomposes coefficients for individual blocks, Chen processes blocks, not the entire image. Therefore the rejection has been maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)]of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 9, 10-11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen (6680976).

As for claims 1, 11, and 17, Chen teaches of decomposing a respective plurality of residual coefficients (wavelets) for respective transform block (Note: Column 19,

Lines 40-50), processing a respective plurality of bit-planes or discrete quantization steps for the respective transform block before decomposing coefficients for a next one of the transform blocks in the image frame (Note: Refined one bit at a time for each subband, and then through the entire bit-plane, Column 19, Lines 51-63).

As for claim 9, Chen teaches of the plurality of bit-planes includes each bit-plane from a most significant bit-plane to a least significant bit-plane (Column 19, Lines 40-63).

As for claim 10, Chen teaches of the transform blocks are formed by one of the group consisting of discrete cosine transform, block-based wavelet coding or matching pursuit and SNR-scalabilities using discrete quantization steps (Column 17, Lines 23-67 and Column 18, Lines 1-46).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 3, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen (6680976).

As for claims 2 and 18, Chen teaches of wavelet blocks with residual coefficients (Column 19, Lines 40-50) but does not teach specifically of discrete cosine transform blocks, and the residual coefficients are DCT residual coefficients. However, it is considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that wavelet and residual

coefficients can be used in place of one another.

As for claims 3 and 19, Chen teaches of the standards H.263 coder (Column 20, Lines 46-51) but does not specifically mention including run-length and variable length coding each of the plurality of bit-planes. However, it is considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the standards H.263 coder would include run-length and variable length coding.

As for claims 4 and 12, Chen does not explicitly teach of storing each bit-plane in a different position, however, it is considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to place bit-planes in different locations in memory so as not to overwrite the previously stored bit-planes. (Official Notice, Along with reference US 6,664,902).

As for claim 6, Chen does not explicitly teach of forming a compressed bitstream containing the respective plurality of bit-planes for all of the DCT blocks in the image frame, wherein the data in the compressed bitstream are arranged by bit-plane, however, it is considered obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have a bitstream in order to transmit the converted bits of data from one point (transmitter) to another (receiver). (Official Notice)

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 5, 7-8, 13-16, and 20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Czekaj whose telephone number is (571) 272-7327. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600